VIII. Appendices

Options Considered

Improvements along South Capitol Street could take many different forms. To begin to define and narrow the range of possibilities, the South Capitol Gateway and Improvement Study analyzed five general transportation options.

The study identified the options' major characteristics, advantages, and disadvantages. It did not recommend one option, as that will require a more-detailed evaluation. An environmental impact statement, a later step in the process, will provide more information that will allow the selection of the most desirable improvements.

The scenarios developed in the National Capital Planning Commission's South Capitol Street Urban Design Study provided the basis for three transportation options. Transportation system characteristics were defined that would fit the physical characteristics of each urban design scenario. The other two transportation options are a no-build option and a separate tunnel option.

In summary, the transportation options are:

Option 1: No-build. No new construction of transportation facilities; a baseline against which all other options were evaluated.

Option 2: A new bridge on South Capitol Street and transportation improvements that would approximate present traffic capacity.

Option 3: A new bridge on South Capitol Street and expanded transportation improvements that would increase traffic and transit capacity.

Option 4: Two new bridges, one on South Capitol Street for through traffic and the other for local traffic.

Option 5: A new bridge on South Capitol Street, which would serve as an at-grade boulevard, and a tunnel constructed under the river to handle through traffic.

Appendix A: Options

Option 1: No-Build

No new transportation facilities would be constructed. Instead, existing facilities would be maintained and repaired, and planned capital improvements in the area would be made according to the District Department of Transportations Capital Improvement Program. It was quickly determined that the dilapidated condition of the corridor's infrastructure could not justify retaining the status quo.

In addition, new development will likely continue, placing additional demands on South Capitol Street and the other area streets. Failure to meet this increased pressure would worsen congestion and further limit access to the area.

Option 1

Option 2: New Bridge, Same Traffic Capacity

A new bridge would carry South Capitol Street over the Anacostia River and South Capitol Street would be redesigned as a six-lane surface boulevard with generous sidewalks and bicycle facilities. This option would provide slightly more traffic capacity than the present roadway system. A transit line would run on a parallel street east of South Capitol Street; several streets are candidates for this location. East of the Anacostia River, the South Capitol Street-Suitland Parkway-I-295 Interchange would be reconfigured to reduce the land area currently consumed by roadways.

Option 2

Option 3

Option 3: New Bridge, Added Traffic Capacity

As in Option 2, a new bridge would carry an at-grade South Capitol Street over the Anacostia River. In this option, however, South Capitol Street would be widened to eight lanes to increase traffic capacity. This option would require the acquisition of additional land to increase the current 130-foot right-of-way. This would allow transit to be placed on South Capitol Street. The South Capitol Street-Suitland Parkway-I-295 interchange would be reconfigured in the same manner as in Option 2.

Acquiring additional land on each side of South Capitol Street to accommodate the widened roadway could require the removal of 24 residences on the west side. Businesses on both sides of the street would be displaced, and St. Vincent de Paul church would have to be relocated. A wider South Capitol Street could also increase accidents and reduce pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Option 4: Two New Bridges

As in Option 2, a new bridge would carry South Capitol Street over the Anacostia River connecting I-395 to Suitland Parkway and I-295. A second bridge, located upriver, would connect to local streets and carry the transit line, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Like Option 3, this option would increase traffic capacity. However, this additional traffic would not be on South Capitol Street. This would result in greater service for local trips rather than regional ones. The South Capitol Street-Suitland Parkway-I-295 Interchange would be similar to the one in Options 2 and 3, and local street connections would be made through Anacostia Park to the second bridge. The second bridge in this option would add significantly to both the initial construction cost and long-term maintenance costs. By serving only local traffic, the second bridge would offer limited traffic benefits. It would also require an increase in the land devoted to highway infrastructure.

Option 4

Option 5

Option 5: New Bridge and New Tunnel

As in Option 2, a new bridge would carry South Capitol Street over the Anacostia River and provide access to the new six-lane boulevard. The new bridge would carry the transit line and the bicycle and pedestrian facilities. In addition, a tunnel would carry through traffic under the river to the I-395-Third Street Tunnel.

This option would increase traffic capacity but in a dramatically different way. It would also have the most positive impact on local neighborhoods, because commuter trips would largely be diverted off South Capitol Street to the tunnel. If the tunnel is constructed, the resulting traffic reduction may also be sufficient to locate a transit line on South Capitol Street. Finally, the South Capitol Street-Suitland Parkway-I-295 interchange would be reconfigured but would include new portals to the tunnel to connect to both northbound and southbound I-295.

Appendix B: Tunnel Construction Considerations

Tunnel Construction Considerations

Constructing a tunnel in conjunction with a new bridge and street improvements is a good strategy for proceeding with this effort. A tunnel expands traffic capacity through the corridor without disrupting neighborhoods with an overly wide thoroughfare. A tunnel to carry through traffic was considered as a river crossing, but an analysis determined that the tunnel should not simply cross the river but extend through the entire study area.

Shorter tunnel concepts that would not extend as far north were also rejected. First, directing through traffic into the Center Leg Tunnel would allow it to stay off South Capitol Street. Second, a tunnel portal located on South Capitol Street would be too disruptive. Third, locating a portal anywhere along South Capitol Street would interfere with the street's alignment and block cross streets.

A tunnel could be constructed using either cut-and-cover or deep-bored construction techniques. The costs of the two techniques are comparable, but a deep-bored tunnel is probably preferable because it would be less disruptive to surface improvements.

The cut-and-cover technique involves the excavation of a trench; the construction of the floor, walls and lid of the tunnel structure; and the restoration of the surface above. In the study area, a cut-and-cover tunnel would have to be built either under South Capitol Street, an adjacent north-south street (Van or Half Street SE) or the land on one side of South Capitol Street.

Building a tunnel under South Capitol Street would require moving the underground utility lines and closing the street to traffic during construction. Rerouting traffic to some other street would be difficult because the other north-south streets in the study area are narrower and not well connected to the transportation network. Building a tunnel under another north-south street could limit the tunnel's width because of the narrower streets. Locating a tunnel under the land beside South Capitol Street would require clearing the land and demolition or relocation of buildings, although the land clearance could be integrated with other economic redevelopment steps.

Building a cut-and-cover tunnel under the Southeast-Southwest Freeway and the railroad overpasses may not be possible. A cut-and-cover tunnel would be relatively shallow and probably would not be able to pass through the piers and footings that support the freeway. Even a deep-bored tunnel would likely be affected by these supports.

A cut-and-cover tunnel would probably connect to a sunken tube to cross the river. To build a sunken tube crossing, a trench would be excavated in the riverbed and one or more prefabricated tubes moved into place and lowered to connect with the cut-and-cover sections on the shore. This construction would require disturbance of the riverbed, causing the potential disruption of contaminated sediment.

The deep-bored tunnel would disrupt the surface only at each end. A tunnel-boring machine would be assembled at one end to excavate the tunnel's entire length. A deep-bored tunnel would have less impact on traffic, would not require land clearance between the tunnel ends, and would avoid riverbed disturbance.

Appendix C: Potential Impacts and Effects

Land Use and Development

The improvements proposed for South Capitol Street would allow it to serve as a catalyst for redevelopment on both sides of the Anacostia River. The resulting new housing opportunities would allow more people to live close to jobs, reduce commuting distances and expand the pool of workers available to employers. Land that is now vacant or used for industrial functions would be more productively utilized. Low-impact development practices would allow the new mixed-use development to contribute to the area's quality of life.

Reconstruction of South Capitol Street, which includes beautifying the corridor and improving access, would also encourage mixed-use development on the parcels along the corridor and in the surrounding neighborhoods. The area's lack of access, poor traffic circulation, and unsightly appearance currently discourage investment.

The effects on land use would vary according to South Capitol Street's width. Widening South Capitol Street would reduce the amount of land available for private investment.

East of the Anacostia River, the reconstruction of the South Capitol Street-Suitland Parkway-I-295 interchange would foster redevelopment that would support the existing neighborhoods. The redesign of interchanges to the south would free up to as much as 20 acres of land now devoted to transportation for redevelopment as public open space or other purposes. In addition, removing through traffic from the block of Howard Road nearest to the Anacostia River and restoring it as a local street would allow its redevelopment for residential or other uses.

Cultural and Historic Resources

Surveys of the area by the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) have identified the potential for cultural resources in the study area, including structures that merit further investigation for determination of their historic significance. Several cultural and historic resources in the study area are already listed on the District of Columbia Inventory of Historic Sites and the National Register of Historic Places, and others might be eligible.

Reconfiguring the street network throughout the South Capitol Street corridor would facilitate maintaining or restoring significant portions of Washington's L'Enfant Plan, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Widening South Capitol Street would alter the original L'Enfant right-of-way of 130 feet. Widening South Capitol Street's right-of-way would also affect buildings identified in District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office records as known and potential historic resources. Determination of impacts and mitigation would be carried out with the District of Columbia Historic Preservation Office and the State Historic Preservation Officer for the District of Columbia.

Phase I will include an archaeological and architectural survey to determine to what extent historic resources would be impacted by future construction activities. Archaeological exploration carried out in conjunction with construction activities would enable the identification and investigation into potentially rich archaeological resources.

Enhancements to the study area would ultimately benefit its cultural and historic resources. The South Capitol Street corridor is in one of the city's oldest sections. The streetscape would respect the area's historic setting and structures. In addition, significant structures within the study area could be preserved and renovated as part of this effort.

Creating the South Capitol Street gateway would also create numerous new opportunities for memorials and monuments. This would reinforce the street's connection to Washington's Monumental Core. Removing roadways from Poplar Point would provide a site for a new memorial or public cultural facility. Land acquired along the east side of South Capitol Street between the U.S. Capitol and the Anacostia River may provide additional cultural and memorial sites.

Right-of-Way Acquisition and Displacements

The South Capitol Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study was carried out with a particular emphasis on developing transportation improvement options that would not require any residential displacement. Some land acquisition would be necessary under any option that would widen South Capitol Street. Widening the street would also require the relocation of St. Vincent de Paul Church, one of the corridor's historic structures.

One potentially negative impact east of the river would be taking land in the Navy's Anacostia Annex to realign South Capitol Street. Negotiation with the Navy concerning any anticipated property acquisition or transfer would be carried out during project design. No displacements of present residents, businesses, or community facilities are anticipated east of the Anacostia River.

Neighborhoods

South Capitol Street now creates a barrier between the District of Columbia's southeast and southwest neighborhoods. Changing it into a boulevard, reconnecting the street grid, improving pedestrian amenities, and providing safer intersections and crosswalks would substantially benefit the residents in the surrounding communities.

Other displacements would depend upon the South Capitol Street right-of-way width between the U.S. Capitol and the Anacostia River. Widening the right-of-way may necessitate the removal of twenty-four residences on the west side of South Capitol Street. In addition, businesses on both sides of the street would be displaced, including retail stores that serve the adjacent neighborhoods. However, new development in the study area, particularly along M Street, could provide new locations for existing businesses and attract new ones.

Transportation and Traffic

The creation of the South Capitol Gateway would significantly impact the transportation system. Construction of a boulevard would change the way traffic flows through the corridor. Because all the options considered in this study would provide traffic capacity at least equal to that of the present roadway, general traffic performance would not differ dramatically from the no-build option. Traffic patterns would improve, however, as drivers could turn off South Capitol Street at the proposed new signalized intersections. Also, the traffic calming effect of roundabouts would reduce speeds.

The addition of a transit right-of-way would dramatically improve transit performance throughout the study area. Transit operations would be faster and more reliable. A dedicated transit line would provide a visual presence that would encourage transit use, and amenities at transit stations would make transit use more comfortable, convenient, and secure.

Improved bicycle facilities would encourage cycling through the study area for both commuting and recreational purposes. Improved pedestrian facilities would not only encourage walking, but would also improve neighborhood access and support development.

The construction of a tunnel under the Anacostia River would have a significant effect on traffic patterns. A tunnel would create increased capacity in a controlled-access facility to I-395 and downtown Washington. The reduction of traffic demand on the Southeast Freeway could allow its removal and the restoration of Virginia Avenue. The improved Virginia Avenue and the 11th Street Bridge would handle local traffic.

Parklands and Public Recreational Facilities

Proposed improvements will avoid impacts to parks and recreation facilities to the extent feasible. Redesign of the interchange east of the river will affect park lands. Net effect is expected to be an increase in the area of park and recreational green space.

The Randall Recreation Center at the northwest corner of South Capitol and Eye Streets SW is impacted in the proposed design. Section 4(f) requirements will be handled during the environmental documentation process.

Air Quality

The Washington Metropolitan Region exceeds the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ground-level ozone. For this pollutant, the region is classified as a severe non-attainment area. The Phase II Attainment Plan for Washington, DC-Maryland-Virginia, prepared by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Metropolitan Air Quality Committee, is the District's State Implementation Plan (SIP). This plan includes strategies for reducing ozone levels throughout the region.

Under the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), transportation plans, programs, and projects in a non-attainment or maintenance area that are funded or approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or Federal Transit Administration (FTA) must conform with the SIP through the process described in the EPA's transportation conformity regulations. By providing increased transit service and reducing both the length of time and the volume of idling cars, transportation improvements in the area have the potential to support these air quality improvement plans. Further investigations will be required to determine if the proposed improvements would be in compliance with the District's SIP.

Utilities

Any new construction should be carefully planned in relation to existing utilities. The study area contains several large utility lines and facilities, including the U.S. Capitol Power Plant and a PEPCO power plant. Sewer pumping stations are located on both sides of the Anacostia River, and large sewer lines run under Washington Avenue, South Capitol Street, New Jersey Avenue, Half Street SE, and Suitland Parkway. These utilities may limit or prevent some improvement options.

The construction of transportation facilities, however, will create opportunities for coordinating street and roadway improvements with sewer upgrades. The DC Water and Sewer Authority's draft long-term control plan for its combined sewer system includes major construction in the South Capitol Street study area.

The DC Water and Sewer Authority (WASA) plans to replace the Poplar Point Pumping Station, which is in the South Capitol Street-Suitland Parkway-I-295 interchange. A site for the station can be selected in coordination with the redesign of the interchange. WASA will rehabilitate the Main and O Street pumping stations, which are just outside the study area.

Most significantly, WASA plans to build a 95-million-gallon storage and conveyance combined sewer overflow tunnel on the west side of the Anacostia River, which will significantly improve the river's water quality. The construction of this facility could be coordinated with South Capitol Street's improvements.

Other utility impacts are also possible, depending upon the locations of a new bridge and other transportation facilities.

Environmental Justice

The communities along South Capitol Street have long endured barriers around and through their neighborhoods created by the transportation infrastructure. In addition, these neighborhoods are inadequately served by the transportation system. Community members expressed their needs and concerns at public meetings, in e-mails, and in comments throughout the South Capitol Gateway and Corridor Improvement Study. Extensive involvement by the community and agency stakeholders, matched with a commitment to no residential takings or displacements, shaped the alternatives to avoid significant negative effects to the human and natural environment.

This reflects a commitment to meeting the letter and spirit of federal environmental justice policy and guidance. Decisions made using effective environmental justice practices will:

- take into account social, economic, and environmental impacts, as well as equity, in dealing with the communities impacted by major transportation projects;
- allocate the benefits and burdens of all programs and projects in a nondiscriminatory manner;
- avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, planning all actions with the participation of the communities impacted; and
- prevent delay in the receipt of transportation benefits by communities of concern; and
- collect data on the affected communities, with a heightened sensitivity to where the minority and low-income populations, as well as persons with disabilities reside (community impact assessment).

Hazardous Waste

Encountering hazardous materials during construction is likely. Land use throughout the study area is predominantly industrial, which suggests a high potential for hazardous materials. Information provided by the District of Columbia Government indicates the presence of numerous underground storage tanks along South Capitol Street. Construction in this area would likely involve extensive remediation. Constructing a new bridge would also require moving the underground storage tanks beneath the current bridge approach and cleaning up contaminated soils. Contamination is also likely in the Anacostia River bottom. Mitigation may be necessary, depending upon the construction techniques used for a new bridge. A Phase I environmental site assessment should be conducted to better determine the potential for contamination in the study area.

Security

South Capitol Street has an important security role in Washington's transportation system. In addition to its designation as one of the city's evacuation routes, South Capitol Street also connects nearby military installations. These include the Navy Yard, the Navy's Anacostia Annex, Fort McNair, Bolling Air Force Base, and Andrews Air Force Base. Ensuring quick and convenient transport between these facilities is in the national interest.

Appendix D: South Capitol Street Vehicular Capacity

Capacity is the maximum vehicular flow rate on a given roadway segment. This study included vehicular capacity calculations for the five options considered for South Capitol Street between the U.S. Capitol and the Anacostia River. Keeping the present roadway with minimal enhancements is the no-build option. Each of the other four options includes transforming South Capitol Street into an at-grade boulevard in conjunction with other transportation infrastructure improvements. These calculations–prepared according to the Highway Capacity Manual procedures for analyzing arterial roadways–determined the allowable capacity, which corresponds to acceptable levels of traffic service.

The present roadway (the no-build option) has the lowest vehicular capacity of the five options. The other four options would increase vehicular capacity. The table below lists the average daily traffic (ADT) capacity for each option.

Option	Roadway Type	Capacity, ADT
1	No–Build—present roadway	45,300
2	6-lane boulevard	57,900
3	8-lane boulevard	77,200
4	6-lane and 4-lane boulevards	95,700
5	4-lane boulevard and 4-lane tunnel	115,800

Assumptions

- In the no-build option, South Capitol Street is an urban arterial with a median, left-turn bays at intersections, 1.33 signalized intersections per mile, and a 45 mph posted speed limit.
- Options 2 through 5 include a boulevard with a median, left-turn bays at intersections, 6.25 signalized intersections per mile, and 35 mph free-flow speeds.
- The acceptable level of service is level of service E, or an average through travel speed of 33 percent or less of the free-flow speed.

I. Introduction

Justice & Sustainability Associates (JSA), in coordination with the consultant team and clients, designed and implemented a public participation plan primarily comprising four public meetings and public information and education.

Schedule:

Public Meeting #1: **Existing Conditions Analysis, 17 October 2002**
Public Meeting #2: **Option Development and Evaluation Criteria, 7 December 2002**
Public Meeting #3: **Option Evaluation and Selection, 25 January 2003**
Public Meeting #4: **Study Findings Summary, 18 March 2003**

The public participation component for the South Capitol Street Gateway and Improvement Study had three objectives:

1. Systematically inform and educate the public about the objectives, opportunities and challenges of the study.
2. Create a neutral environment in order to encourage and document written and verbal expression of a diverse range of public opinion.
3. Construct a public constituency for the short- and long-term objectives of the project.

Appendix E: Documentation of Public Meetings

To increase public participation, JSA launched and maintained an interactive project website located at www.publicspaceforum.org. To ensure full and effective public information and education, the JSA team identified stakeholder groups and individuals having a potential interest in the study. The team's efforts targeted at least three distinct groups of stakeholder audiences.

- Near neighbors and residents of physically affected neighborhoods including Advisory Neighborhood Commissions, churches, schools, community based organizations, and businesses in the study area.
- Special interest advocates (cycling, environmental protection, commuters, etc.)
- Institutional actors (Navy Yard, WMATA, NCPC)

The goal of public information and education was to provide the public with accurate, understandable, pertinent, and timely information so that the public could contribute effectively to the study, especially by attending the public meetings. Methods included:

- PublicSpaceForum.org website
- Press releases and fact sheets
- Community calendar announcements
- DC Cable
- TV and radio interviews
- Newsletters (electronic and print)
- Flyers
- Announcement cards
- Advertisements in print media
- Phone calls and meeting visits to stakeholder groups and individuals

JSA's project manager chose public meeting locations for their easy access within or near the study area.

The post-meeting reports included tallying the sign-in sheets and summarizing the public viewpoints. Reports were posted on the PublicSpaceForum.org website. JSA staff also communicated at each meeting how public participants' input affected the decisions made by the study team. This closed communications loop helped the project team goal earn and retain the public's trust while ensuring the credibility of the study process.

II. Public Meeting #1

Public Kick-Off Meeting, Thursday, October 17, 2002
6:30–8:30 pm at Van Ness Elementary School, 1150 5th Street, SE

Fifty people registered as participants in the first public meeting. At this meeting, they learned about the study's area, vision, purpose, and the Congressional mandate. Consultants highlighted the conditions and issues the study would address, including the bridge, the approach to the Capitol, and neighborhood barriers. Display areas featured related studies such as the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative, the National Capital Planning Commission South Capitol Street Urban Design Study, and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority studies.

Assessment of Community's Feedback

Meeting Evaluation Form

Of the 50 who signed in, 17 filled out the Meeting Evaluation Form. With 70 percent of the responses showing a good to excellent rating, the audience appreciated that the study was "holistic" and that the participants had time to ask questions and voice their opinions. The presentations were informative and gave the audience an understanding of the study process. They were ready to learn more details of the conditions and issues within the Southwest area. The respondents' comments express that the public felt listened to and the team was responsive. Participants stressed the importance of two issues in particular relating to Carrollsburg Place in Southwest Washington and bicycling.

Carrollsburg Place

Residents needed to know that neighborhoods, such as Carrollsburg Place, will remain intact through the changes of the South Capitol corridor.

Bicycling

Cycling activists asked that cycling organizations be engaged in the process. Safety is their primary issue. They also desire a pedestrian/bike bridge from New Jersey Avenue to Poplar Point.

"Your Ideas" Form

The participant User Guide included a worksheet, "Your Ideas" form. Prompted by two questions, it captured what individual community members determined to be their biggest problem with and what they appreciate most about transportation around South Capitol Street.

1. My biggest problem(s) with transportation around South Capitol Street
   Three main concerns emerged from the responses:
   - inadequate bicycle and pedestrian-friendly paths
   - concerns about the high amount of traffic and congestion
   - concerns about the future of homes on Carrollsburg Place

2. The things I appreciate most about transportation around South Capitol Street
   The three main acknowledgements:
   - bicycle paths along South Capitol Street bridge
   - the varying views of the Capitol from crossing the river
   - the connections to the major transportation routes (I-395, Suitland Parkway, and BW Parkway)

III. Public Meeting #2

Public Meeting #2, Saturday, December 7, 2002
9:00 am–noon at Savoy Elementary School, 2400 Shannon Place, SE

The primary purpose of the December workshop was to present and receive feedback on options for solving congestion and safety problems and for transforming the South Capitol Street Corridor into a gateway to the nation's capital. The consultants also introduced the draft evaluation criteria to the public. This draft document outlined the values and the tradeoffs when examining the options and the rights-of-way.

Assessment of Community's Feedback

Meeting Evaluation Form

Of the 71 who signed in, 25 percent filled out the Meeting Evaluation Form. Two-thirds rated this meeting as satisfactory. The presentation was informative, but participants wanted to dialogue more. The prevailing question was "What is this going to look like?"

IV. Public Meeting #3

Public Meeting #3: Saturday, January 25, 2003
9:00 am–noon at Savoy Elementary School, 2400 Shannon Place, SE

At the January workshop, the study team provided newly developed material and drawings that clearly demonstrated different traffic and right-of-way possibilities. In four facilitated Learning Stations, participants evaluated five transportation options and three right-of-way conditions based on the evaluation criteria. At the Learning Stations they discussed the benefits and drawbacks of each in reference to land use and infrastructure, including regional and local transportation, neighborhood revitalization, the relationship to the Anacostia waterfront and the creation of a gateway/boulevard to the nation's capital.

Evaluation Criteria

Mobility and Transportation Criteria

- Create a great urban boulevard on South Capitol Street.
- Provide an acceptable level of service for existing and anticipated local and regional traffic.
- Reduce the negative impact of the transportation network on the adjacent neighborhoods.
- Improve public transit service by providing a separate public transit right-of-way through the corridor.
- Improve the safety and convenience of pedestrian and bicycle movement within and through the study area.
- Improve the potential for the future removal of the Southeast-Southwest Freeway.

Cultural and Aesthetic Criteria

- Improve the visual quality of the corridor.
- Create a visual environment in harmony with the monumental character of a gateway to Washington's monumental core.
- Create appropriate locations for museums and memorials.
- Minimize negative impacts to cultural and historic resources.

Neighborhood Criteria

- Minimize residential displacements.
- Minimize negative impacts to low-income and minority neighborhoods.
- Create a fair transportation benefit to low-income and minority neighborhoods.
- Create open space for recreational activities.
- Promote access to the Anacostia waterfront.

Environmental Criteria

- Minimize negative impacts to the natural and built environment.
- Minimize negative impacts to existing infrastructure and utilities.
- Benefit and improve the existing environment.

Economic Development Criteria

- Support the development of a new mixed-use employment corridor.
- Support economic opportunity for existing businesses and residents.
- Support public agency and private business plans and programs.

Feasibility Criteria

- Impose reasonable costs.
- Allow early completion.
- Minimize disruption during construction.
- Create a great urban boulevard in the tradition of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Right-of-Way West of the Anacostia River

National Capital Planning Commission's South Capitol Street Urban Design Study identified three potential conditions:

- A: 130-foot right-of-way, existing width
- B: 220-foot right-of-way widened to alleys on both sides
- C: 325-foot right-of-way widened only on east to Van Street, SE

Transportation Options

Option 1: No Build

Option 2: New Bridge, Same Capacity for Cars

- Six through lanes, median, and sidewalks on South Capitol
- Transit way and bicycle lanes on First Street, SE
- Right-of-way: A, B, or C

Option 3: New Bridge, Added Capacity for Cars

- Eight through lanes, median, and sidewalks on South Capitol
- Transit way in median
- Bicycle lanes at curb
- Right-of-way: B

Option 4: Two New Bridges, Added Capacity

- Six through lanes, median, and sidewalks on South Capitol
- Transit way and bicycle lanes on First Street, SE
- Right-of-way: A, B, or C

Option 5: New Bridge and Tunnel, Added Capacity

- Four through lanes, median, and sidewalks on South Capitol and six lanes in tunnel
- Transit way in median
- Bicycle lanes at curb
- Right-of-way: A, B, or C

Assessment of Community's Feedback

Meeting Evaluation Form

Participants gave a favorable review of the third public meeting, finding that the Learning Stations allowed for more discussion. Because of the complexity and the details of the study, the Learning Stations served to enhance the public's understanding through a more intimate setting.

Evaluation Criteria Worksheets

Participants used the evaluation criteria to judge how well each possible right-of-way and transportation option met the study goals. A ranking system was used. On a worksheet for the right-of-way west of the Anacostia River, 1 referred to the most preferred and 3 to the least preferred. On a worksheet for transportation options, 1 referred to the most preferred and 5 to the least preferred.

Right-of-way West of the Anacostia River

A. CULTURAL & AESTHETIC CRITERIA—the 325-foot right-of-way received the highest of the most preferred (1) ranking. 220-foot received the highest of the least preferred. Both the 325-foot and the 220-foot received the same number of median ranking.

B. NEIGHBORHOOD CRITERIA—130-foot, highest most preferred. 220-foot, highest least preferred.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA—130-foot, highest most preferred. 325-foot and 220-foot, equally least preferred.

D. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA—130-foot, highest most preferred. 220-foot, highest least preferred.

The 130-foot right-of-way was the most preferred overall. According to the tally, its strength is in economic development. 325-foot, the second in overall ranking, is strongest in the environmental criteria.

Transportation Options

A. MOBILITY AND TRANSPORTATION CRITERIA—Option 5, most preferred. Option 1, least preferred.

B. NEIGHBORHOOD CRITERIA—Option 2, most preferred. However Options 3, 4, and 5 are close in high preference.

C. ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA—Option 2, most preferred with no one ranking it as the least preferred. Option 1, least preferred.

D. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA—Option 1, highest number of least preferred. But five people did give it a most-preferred ranking. Option 2, highest most preferred and the lowest in least preferred. No one ranked Option 2 as the least preferred on these criteria.

E. FEASIBILITY CRITERIA—People tended to prefer change, except in feasibility.

V. Public Meeting #4

Public Meeting #4, Tuesday, March 18, 2003
6:30–8:30 pm at St. Augustine's Episcopal Church, 600 M Street, SW

At this final public meeting, the fewer than fifty participants included advisory neighborhood commissioners, commuters (residents from VA), a strong representation from Half Street, SW, and residents from east of the river. The meeting purpose was to present a summary of the study findings and the next steps.

Community concerns and questions included the aesthetic improvements and plans for the industrial uses, the potential ballpark site on M Street, residential displacements, and potential connections of Potomac Avenue to South Capitol Street and to New Jersey Avenue.

Assessment of Community's Feedback

Meeting Evaluation Form

Participants described it as a "very informative" meeting. One statement captured the intent of public participation: "Public meetings/involvement is most beneficial when citizen input is utilized. Otherwise it is not contributing to a good design plan. Please use 'good/quality' citizen input wisely."

VI. Summary

Through the public participation component of the South Capitol Street Gateway and Improvement Study a diverse population of stakeholders became participants in meeting the goals of the study. Further, it provided a means to document extensive information and to demonstrate its capacity to create a constituency for improvements.

Interagency Coordinating Committee

DC Department of Transportation
Dan Tangherlini
John F. Deatrick, AICP, P.E.
Kathleen Penney, P.E.
Allen Miller, P.E.
Alex Eckmann
Rachel MacCleery
Charles Thomas
Ronald Mitchell

DC Office of Planning
Uwe Brandes, AICP

Federal Highway Administration
Sandra Jackson

National Capital Planning Commission
William G. Dowd, P.E.
George Toop, AIA

National Park Service
Sally Blumenthal

Commission of Fine Arts
Frederick Lindstrom
Kristina Alg

Architect of the Capitol
Michael Keegan

U.S. Department of the Navy
John Imparato

Fort Myer Military Community
Sharon Walker

United States Coast Guard
Nick Mpras

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
George Harrison

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Christopher Ball

General Services Administration
Thomas Otto

Maryland Department of Transportation
Edward Strocko

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority
Art Lawson

District of Columbia ANC 6D
Robert Siegel
Andy Litsky

DC Water and Sewer Authority
James Shabelski, P.E.
Eva Mortenson

DC Department of Housing and Community Development
James Thackaberry

DC Department of Parks and Recreation
Ted Pochter

DC Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs
Bob Kelly

Consultant Team

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.
Philip H. Braum
Robert P. Irwin, P.E.
Margaret Cederoth, AICP
Robert Kalbach, P.E.
Susannah Kerr Adler, AIA
Susan Anderson
Greer Gillis, P.E.
Christine Hoeffner, AICP
Jessica Juriga, P.E.

Joseph Passonneau & Partners
Architecture and Civil Engineering
Joseph Passonneau, FAIA
David Akopian

Franck Lohsen McCrery, Architects
Urban Design Consultant
Michael M. Franck, AIA
Arthur C. Lohsen, AIA
James C. McCrery II, AIA
Michael John Ray, AIA
Charles S.P. Bergen, AIA
Julia Grace Hughitt
Abdul Muzikir
C.J. Howard
Elizabeth Ruedisale

Editorial Consultant
Christina K. Wilson, PhD

Graphic Design Consultant
Jennifer Byrne

Justice & Sustainability Associates, LLC
Public Outreach Consultant
Don Edwards
Hadiah S. Jordan

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADT	Average Daily Traffic
AIA	American Institute of Architects
AICP	American Institute of Certified Planners
AWI	Anacostia Waterfront Initiative
CAA	Clean Air Act
DC	District of Columbia
DCOP	District of Columbia Office of Planning
DDOT	District of Columbia Department of Transportation
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
MPH	Miles per hour
NE	Northeast
NCPC	National Capital Planning Commission
NCRC	National Capital Revitalization Corporation
NW	Northwest
P.E.	Professional Engineer
SE	Southeast
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SW	Southwest
U.S.	United States of America
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
WASA	District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority
WMATA	Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration

District Department of Transportation

A cooperative effort of the U.S. Department of Transportation / Federal Highway Administration, District Department of Transportation, National Park Service and National Capital Planning Commission.